

Ripley Advertiser.

Vol. 1.

RIPLEY MISSISSIPPI, SEPTEMBER, 16, 1843.

No. 47.

RIPLEY ADVERTISER

J. F. FORD.

TERMS:—The ADVERTISER will be issued regularly every Saturday, at \$2.50 in advance, in every instance. No subscription will be received for a less period than six months. ADVERTISEMENTS will be charged at the rate of ONE DOLLAR per square, (ten lines or less) for the first insertion, and fifty cents for each continuance. Announcing candidates for office—ten for State and five for County—invariably in advance. The FASH will be required for all job work when delivered—this rule will be strictly observed. Letters addressed to this office on business, must be post paid, or they might not be attended to. Advertisements should be marked with the number of insertions on the margin, or they will be continued until ordered out, as charged accordingly.

PONTOTOC, Sept. 4th 1843.

To the Editor of the Ripley Advertiser.

SIR—An effusion in the form of a letter signed C. A. Bradford, and addressed to Col. Thos. H. Williams, has been published in the Southern Tribune of the 23rd ult. This document contains misrepresentations, which as the personal friend of Col. Williams, I feel it my duty to put right, and ask the use of your columns for that purpose. I have no disposition to engage in a controversy with Mr. Bradford, and would not interfere between the parties, but for the fact, that the position of Col. Williams before the public, makes it inconvenient, if not improper, for him to notice every slander that may be uttered against him. It is not my object to review the whole of Mr. Bradford's letter, but only to notice some of its most prominent features.

The first issue between the parties, and that which is deemed of most importance, will be presented by reading from his letter to Col. Williams, the following extract: "You say we all reflect the warmth with which you pressed your claims, as a democratic Bond payer, for the office of District Attorney two years ago." &c. You sir, recollect no such thing, the charge is untrue and you know it, or had the means of knowing it." In relation to this matter, I have no doubt but that there are hundreds within the 9th Judicial District who are ready to pronounce this declaration of Mr. Bradford an impudent falsehood, uttered in the face of a community that know better, and intended for effect at a distance; I however, am not disposed to call it by so harsh a name—I regard it as a kind of special pleading. He surely will not deny that he ran as a Bond-payer. He only means that he felt no "warmth" for the interest of the bond payers, and that Col. Williams "had the means of knowing it." What these means were, Mr. Bradford does not say. It may be that he had reference to the well known fact, which any man of common observation, who had noticed his course for any considerable time, might have seen with half an eye, that his public declarations do not always correspond with his private opinions, as in the case of his preference for the United States Bank, which he has always publicly condemned; and hence, that it would be unsafe for others to believe a man who does not always believe himself; or indeed he might have been willing to whisper to his friend in strict confidence, that at the moment when he attended the indignation meeting at the Court House, in January 1840, and supported the Resolutions condemning the doctrine of the Message, and affirming the liability of the State, he did so, as he now discloses, with a mental reservation, and that his opinion there formed that the State was not liable, "crude as it was," had been gaining strength for nearly two years! But Col. W. asked for no confidential disclosures, and it was his own fault if he remained ignorant of the fact that his friend felt no "warmth" except for the office. But if Mr. Bradford means to deny that he ran as a Bond payer, then I appeal to the facts, and will array them before the reader.

Reference has already been made to the meeting held at the Court House in the winter of 1840 to give a public expression adverse to the doctrine of Repudiation advanced by Gov. McNutt in his message. Mr. Bradford admits that he attended this meeting and approved its object. In making further reference to the meeting I shall not stop to award to Mr. Bradford the credit that is due to the public functionary, filling a large space in the public eye, who approves, by a public and solemn act, that which his Judgment condemns; but will proceed to state that the meeting referred to was held pursuant to notice previously given, and was attended by Citizens of the country as well as those of the Town.

After it was organized, resolutions were introduced condemning the doctrine of the Message and affirming the liability of the State in the most unequivocal terms. These Resolutions were debated at considerable length—not because there was a single anti-bond in the house; but because some persons present were fearful of releasing the stockholders. They were finally passed with only one dissenting voice, Mr. Bradford voting in the affirmative; and copies ordered to be forwarded to our Representatives then at Jackson. Mr. Bradford took an active part in the discussion of these Resolutions, making more than one set speech, and urging their adoption with his usual ability, never once intimating that the "horrors" he felt for the "odious" doctrine of the message were merely Editorial. Hence we had a right, at least, to regard him as being sincere in the opinions advanced by him. I have been thus particular in relation to this meeting and the part Mr. Bradford took in it, for the purpose of showing that at the time referred to he did identify himself with the Bond-payers. And now in order to show that he did run for the office of District Attorney as a Bond-payer, it will only be necessary to refer to his speech at Houston in reply to Mr. Acker.

It will be recollected that Mr. Acker was an opposing Candidate for District Attorney. They met at Houston in Chickasaw County. Mr. Acker made an Anti-bond speech, and was replied to by Charles A. Bradford as a Bond-payer. I am free to confess that I did not hear this speech, not being there; but I have conversed with several persons who did. If it be denied the proof is at hand. But this is not all. The papers in this case will show, that Mr. Bradford afterwards had a contest with Mr. Acker on the same question in Itawamba, and for the purpose of fastening inconsistency upon him undertook to confront him with his Houston speech. With this view he wrote to Col. W. for a statement of what Mr. Acker did say at Houston. Unfortunately for Mr. B. Col. W. filed his letter which is now in my hands, and a copy of which I will introduce here.

PONTOTOC Sept. 8. 1840.

DEAR SIR—I have just returned from Itawamba and am much gratified with my prospects there. Acker has been making prodigious exertions to get up an excitement in that county also upon the Bond question; and he represented his opinions there very differently from those he expressed in his speech at Chickasaw.

My object in writing you is to ask a statement under your hand, giving a brief synopsis of his remarks upon that question at Houston. And that you may Judge whether I have understood him correctly, I stated in Itawamba that he expressed himself substantially in the following manner.

Mr. Acker said he was opposed to taxing the people for the purpose of paying the U. S. Bank Bonds, and that he would freely shed his blood in resistance of taxation. That he was in favor of putting the Bank in to immediate liquidation, and having its affairs economically wound up; its assets collected and applied to the payment of the interest upon the Bonds, and the principal, when its instalments respectively shall fall due. He was also in favor of trying the question of the liability of the Stockholders, and if decided to be liable, he was in favor of strictly enforcing the liability and entirely opposed to releasing them. When all these means for the payment of the principal and interest upon the Bonds should be exhausted, and any balance remained unpaid, it would then be time enough to determine whether the State should pay such balance. He said the agitation of this question, at this time, was entirely premature. That it had nothing at all to do with the office he was seeking at the hands of the people, but that he gave his opinions merely because he thought the people might probably want to know them.

Please write by my Son. I shall return to Itawamba to be present at a public meeting at Fulton, on Friday, where Jacob Thompson is to speak. I wish your letter to take with me.

Acker has failed in effecting anything to aid him materially in his Election, by the Bond question. I found but two families, and them connexions, who think of voting for him, and they are not determined upon it—His failure there is almost as signal as it was in Chickasaw.

Very truly and respectfully yours

C. A. Bradford.

Hon. Thos. H. Williams.

Now what are we to understand from all this? If Mr. Bradford was running as a Neutral, why did he charge Mr. Acker with "making prodigious exertions to get up an excitement in that County also, upon

the Bond question? If he had not taken issue with Mr. Acker upon that question, why did he charge Mr. Acker with having represented his opinions there, very differently from those he expressed in his speech at Chickasaw? If he was not running as a Bond-payer, why did he ask a statement of what Mr. Acker did say in his anti bond speech at Houston, to be used against him at a public meeting in Fulton? If he had not discussed the question in Itawamba how could he detail to Col. W. what he had, in Itawamba, charged Mr. Acker with having said in his Houston speech? If the contest had not been pretty warm, why did he return in haste from Itawamba and send his son to Col. W. for a statement "under your hand," to be used at Fulton "on Friday?" If he did not think he had demolished Mr. Acker in the discussion as far as it had gone, why did he say, "Acker has failed in effecting anything to aid him materially in his Election by the Bond question?" If he was not proud of his victory, why did he say "His failure there is almost as signal as it was at Chickasaw?" And lastly, if he did not think he had laid it on to Mr. Acker in his Houston speech, why did he compare Mr. Acker's "signal failure" in Chickasaw? But Mr. Bradford relies upon the recollection of 1000 witnesses within the ninth Judicial district, to prove that he did not run as a Bond payer. I might, and do rely upon the recollection of an equal number to prove that he did, yet I am willing to concede for once there may be some truth in his statement. It will be recollected that at the commencement of the Canvass, in the spring of 1841, the doctrine of Repudiation might be likened to a little leaven, and that before the close, it had well nigh leavened the whole lump. It is not strange, therefore, that he should run as a Bond-payer at the outset. It is only surprising that he should continue to press that question up to the 8th of Sept, the date of his letter to Col. W. It is proper that I should mention here, that Col. W. did furnish the statement asked for by Mr. Bradford, retaining a copy which is also now in my hands. But I have not learned whether it was or was not used against Mr. Acker at Fulton or elsewhere. As a matter of opinion I should say it was not. I have it upon the authority of Col. Williams that, shortly after the statement was given, he saw Mr. Bradford and took occasion to admonish him, that he was running the Bond question too hard; that he would certainly lose votes by it, and that inasmuch as it had nothing to do with the duties of District Attorney, it was not necessary to press the question. This hint I should say was enough. Though it may have been "rumor ed" that Mr. B. is waning in common sense, yet all will admit that when he is ever put upon the right trail, he follows it with the keen scent of a Blood Hound. I have no doubt, therefore, but that he began at once to haul off, and even to whisper to some of his anti-bond friends that he had always felt some misgivings in relation to the supplemental Charter. I will also admit as being very probable, that his 1000 witnesses, chiefly anti-bonders, however, well remember that after the 8th of September he was never heard to discuss, or press the Bond question before the public, at least during the canvass; and that he avoided it in every way, as was his "acknowledged duty." But he had pressed the question a little too hard before that time; and if "Rumor" may be trusted for anything he lost many votes in Tiptah, in consequence of the fact being too well known there, that he had pressed the question a little too hard in other places.

I pass now to Mr. Bradford's rejoinder, in relation to his journey to Jackson, to purchase and conduct a paper in support of the Repudiating administration of Gov. Tucker. From the whole context of his letter, it will be seen that he acknowledges the effort to purchase and conduct the repudiating paper, and seeks to justify himself upon the ground that, during the canvass, he had heard many speeches upon the question, which strengthened his previously conceived opinions against the liability of the State, and that the Bond question was then generally regarded as settled. Is it true that Mr. B., or any body else, regarded it as settled at that time—or at any time since?—for it will be seen that he made his trip to Jackson while the Election returns "were coming in!" The truth is, every body knew a battle had to be fought through the legislative Halls—Gov. Tucker had not been installed—The Legislature had not met—To have given up the cause therefore, before the forces had been brought into the field, would have required a very pacific spirit on the part of the Bond paying party. No, no, the bond payers never believed the success of their cause was staked upon the result of that battle. But to return, Mr. Bradford not only seeks to justify himself, but to hold Col. W. guilty for approving the step, and giving him a letter to Gov. Tucker, to promote his object. Now let us look a little closer into the facts. It will be seen by a further reference to Mr. B's letter, that he had determined to make the effort, and had engaged a partner in the enterprise, and was actually on his way to Jackson, when he called on Col. W. to see and advise with him on the "propriety of the step." No no Mr. Bradford, that was not your object. You only wanted a letter to Gov. Tucker, your new liege Lord to give in your allegiance to him, lest some one else might step in before you. Your business at Jackson was to purchase the Mississippian, and how could Gov. Tucker promote that object? What could Col. W. do? Mr. Bradford had already decided on the "propriety of the step" and actually embarked in the enterprise. It was too late then, to advise with his friend. Col. W. was not his keeper, and had no right to order him back. There is no evidence that Mr. B. informed Col. W. then, as he did Mr. Abbott afterwards, that he had gone over to the Repudiators, and however much the Col. might regret the step that had been taken, he could not fail to see that it was a meat and bread business. Mr. Bradford had lost his election, was out of employment, and had a large family to support. Under such circumstances it would have been cruel in Col. W. to have frowned upon any enterprise that was not absolutely criminal. The worst that could be said, is that Mr. B. was hiring out his mercenary self, as the Prince of Hesse sometimes hires out his mercenary soldiers, to fight in foreign service.

The next thing to be noticed is Mr. B's canvass for public printer. And here I must remark, that altho' he does not give a true version of the "soft impeachment" to which he pleads guilty, yet he refers to it, by its title, and confesses the whole. The impeachment which he thus confesses, will be seen by reference to Col. W's letter, in these words. "Failing in that, you induced me to believe you had returned to your first love, and that you were in good faith, a Democratic Bond payer; and as such, I gave you my support for public printer, and electioneered for you with the Bond payers, both whigs and democrats, tho' as I have since learned, you were at the same time, seeking the support of the Repudiators as an anti-bond." This admission on the part of Mr. Bradford, is the more valuable, because it goes to show, that he did run for the office of public printer as a bond payer, and that Col. W. did receive him back into the true fold, without requiring him to bring forth fruit meet for repentance, by a new profession of faith. And surely no person will contend that it was unchristian, to forgive his backsliding. But Mr. B. in confessing the "soft impeachment," goes on to say that he "approached some half a dozen Anti Bond democrats for support for printer," pretty much as Col. Williams "sought their support for speaker." What palliation would it afford Mr. B. if Col. W. were equally guilty with himself? And what better evidence of depravity can there be, than to see a man always trying to drag down others into the degradation of his own guilt? But I take issue with him upon the charge thus insidiously made against Col. W. and defy the proof. Mr. Bradford has admitted, tacitly at least, that he canvassed for public printer professing to be a Bond payer and at the same time seeking the support of the Repudiators, as an anti-bond. And will he dare to say that Col. W. ran for speaker and sought the votes of the repudiators as an anti-bond? He dare not. He has not "the recklessness and mendacity" to do that. I will only add that I do not believe Col. W. was a Candidate for speaker at the time referred to. He knew that he went to Jackson in a very lean minority, and that he was peculiarly unpalatable to the Repudiators, and I cannot believe that with the "extraordinary ingenueness" which Mr. B. ascribes to him, he would think for a moment of aspiring to the office of speaker, or consent to be run for it. It is doubtless true that he had among the Bond payers a few devoted friends, who would scorn to vote for the old Repudiator. And it is probable that a few votes may have been cast for him, not because he was a Candidate, nor because any body expected to elect him.

Our Hero—for surely he is by this time a Hero—goes on to make evidence with an eye to a certain letter. He says, "Before

the election came on the Bond question was mooted, and I was interrogated as to my opinions upon the liability of the state. I promptly replied in substance, that I had not given such an examination to the subject as to entitle the opinion I had formed to any weight or consideration; but my opinion was, that the state was not liable and that I regarded the Bond question as settled." Does he mean to say that this "prompt reply" was made publicly and in presence of the Bond-payers, as well as others? I presume not; for it will be recollected that he ran as a Bond-payer, and that upon a count of noses, it was only necessary to "approach some half a dozen anti-Bond Democrats for support." He doubts, less refers to his fatal Abbott letter! Oh that letter! Had it never been written, there would have been no necessity for the humiliating confession, now for the first time made, that he never believed the state was liable, although he had always publicly professed to be a Bond-payer. But for that letter, there would have been no necessity for his reconversion, "made to order" by Judge Smith. But he has got that fatal letter back, and unless he will produce it, I am not bound to take his own version of his "prompt reply." I am at liberty to prove its contents. I charge then, that he went the whole Hog, and held that the state was neither legally, nor morally bound to pay the Bonds; yet he tells us every where that he was always opposed to Repudiation—a better Bond payer, truly, than any other man in the state! He goes on to inform us that the Election resulted in the choice of "Fall and Price for Printers." Oh faithless Anti-Bonders! Although they held his Bond that he was a good Repudiator, they refused to vote for him! It may be, however, that his Bond only tended to lessen their confidence in him, knowing as they did that he had always publicly professed to be a Bond Payer, good and true. He goes on to relate shortly after this: his conversion to the true faith by Judge C. P. Smith. This conversion at the first blush would seem almost miraculous; for is it not a little strange, that Judge Smith, with less than half an argument, should be able to remove deep rooted errors, which had been gaining strength for more than two years, from this man of Giant Mind, who was able to drag an unworthy individual, from merited obscurity, and give him political importance? Strange that such a man had not been able within two years, to elaborate an argument as conclusive to himself at least, as the fragment of an argument elaborated by Judge Smith, who does not claim to have given political importance to any body. But after all, there is nothing strange about it. He was in an excellent mood to be converted, mortified and disappointed, he brooded over his defeat, which doubtless his self-love charged to the treachery of the anti-bonders, for whom he had sacrificed so much. No wonder he did not believe the fish story after that. Under such circumstances, it is not strange that he should receive with gladness, the truth as it is in Judge Smith. Before this, he had only joined the Bond payers as a seeker, if indeed he had not made a hypocritical profession. But now he has experienced the heart work, and is received into full fellowship and communion. No back sliding no falling from grace now. No fighting in the ranks of the Repudiators after this. The tree is known by its fruit, and shall we not see him girding on his armor, and fighting manfully in the ranks of the Bond payers now? The next act in this great drama is soon disposed of. It is in relation to the Canvass of our Hero for Auditor of public accounts. He says "upon this also I consulted you and you approved of my running." Agreed. And he approves it yet. Mr. B. was then a good bond payer and had a right to his new Church privilege, of being a Candidate for office; though it might have been full soon to make him an Elder. He goes on to make an insidious thrust at Col. W. relative to his nomination for Gov. two years ago. And for the purpose of giving it effect makes a willful misrepresentation, only worthy of him; but not worthy of notice.

In relation to his Prospectus for publishing a democratic Bond-paying paper at Pontotoc our Hero says "This also you advised and encouraged so far as talking over encourages a news paper" Hah! Talking did you say? some folks pay do they? This italicized word speaks volumes. It explains the reason why so many pulls have appeared in the Pontotoc paper since its establishment. Perhaps it explains the reason why the name of Col. W. has been taken down and that of Judge Brown put up. I should

[Concluded on fourth page]